

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT:	S. Yoshiura et al.	CONF. NO.:	3184
U.S. SERIAL NO.:	10/052,163	GROUP:	2625
FILED:	January 17, 2002	EXAMINER:	G. Garcia
FOR:	METHOD FOR MANAGING ELECTRONIC APPARATUS, ELECTRONIC APPARATUS, AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR THE SAME		

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REMARKS: PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

The following remarks support Applicants' "Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review" filed herewith in the above-referenced application. These remarks constitute no more than five pages, and are being filed with a Notice of Appeal, thereby satisfying the requirements.

Claims 1-19 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,950,148 to Nakagawa et al. ("Nakagawa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully request review of the Final Office Action in the above-referenced application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

Applicants are filing the "Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review" based on the following clear errors and/or omissions in the Final Office Action mailed on December 17, 2007.

First Clear Error and/or Omission in the Final Office Action:

The Examiner has made a first clear error and/or omission at least because the Nakagawa reference does not teach or suggest a method for managing at least one electronic apparatus or an electronic apparatus in which verification of identification information of a portable terminal is carried out **entirely** in the electronic apparatus, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

Referring to column 13, lines 1-16 of Nakagawa (as cited on page 9 of the Final Office Action), it is stated that "identification data is transmitted from the copying machine 1 to the host computer 40" (column 13, lines 1-3).

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Nakagawa that the copying machine 1 (cited as allegedly corresponding to the claimed "electronic apparatus") somehow verifies the received identification data. In contrast, Nakagawa teaches that identification data is transmitted to a host computer 40, where further processing is performed. One of ordinary skill in the art, in reviewing the Nakagawa reference, would not find any teaching or suggestion that verification of the identification data of the portable terminal device 30 occurs **entirely** in the electronic apparatus, as required in independent claims 1 and 14.

In Nakagawa, when a portable terminal device 30 is connected to the copying machine 1, the identification data of the terminal device 30 is transmitted to the host computer 40 (see column 15, lines 63-67 of Nakagawa). Subsequently, the host computer 40 "judges whether the read check code agrees with the check code specified by the identification data" (column 16, lines 3-6).

In other words, in Nakagawa, the check codes of the copying machine 1 and the portable terminal device 30 are compared in the host computer 40, and thus processing or verification is carried out in the host computer 40, not the copying machine 1.

There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Nakagawa that verification of identification information of a portable terminal is carried out **entirely** in the electronic apparatus (i.e., the copying machine 1 of Nakagawa).

Second Clear Error and/or Omission in the Final Office Action:

The Examiner has made a second clear error and/or omission at least because the Nakagawa reference, whether taken alone or in combination with a description of Japanese publication 2-126357 in the Nakagawa reference, does not teach or suggest a method for managing at least one electronic apparatus or an electronic apparatus in which verification of identification information of a portable terminal is carried out **entirely** in the electronic apparatus, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

On page 9 of the Final Office Action, it was stated: "Examiner asserts that the verification is performed within the copying machine, and it is [sent] to the host computer as part of the service maintenance," citing column 2, lines 16-34 of Nakagawa.

In Nakagawa, column 2, lines 16-34 refer to Japanese Publication 2-126357. However, the relevance of this Japanese publication has not been explained, and the reference to column 2, lines 16-34 is believed to be in error. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in the description provided in column 2, lines 16-34 that verification of identification information of a portable terminal is carried out **entirely** in an electronic apparatus, where column 2, lines 16-34 of Nakagawa refers to a "system which is connected to a host to maintain a terminal."

It is noted that according to column 14, lines 16-34 of Nakagawa, a copying machine 1 transmits an ID code to a host computer 40, and the host computer 40 "memorizes data on the level of the skill of each operator together with his ID code" (see column 14, lines 16-21). Then,

maintenance data is memorized according to the skill level of the operator, and the host computer 40 reads the level of skill transmitted from the copying machine 1 (see column 14, lines 21-26).

In other words, as described in column 14, lines 16-34 of Nakagawa, processing steps are carried out in the host computer 40.

In contrast, independent claims 1 and 14 of the Applicants' claimed invention require that verification of identification information of a portable terminal is carried out **entirely** in the electronic apparatus (i.e., the copying machine 1 of Nakagawa).

Applicants submit that all of the claims under final rejection are in condition for allowance and should be allowed, and that the Final Office Action should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Date: March 14, 2008

Phone: (617) 517-5531

Customer No. 21874